

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HAZELBURY BRYAN PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN HAZELBURY BRYAN  
VILLAGE HALL ON TUESDAY 6<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2015 AT 8.00 PM**

**Present:** Councillors Steve Murcer (SM), David Maughan (DM); Phil Dimmock (PD), John Grayson (JG), Martin Richards (MR) and Alun Read (AR). Members of the public – 10. Also in attendance were Stephen Clark and Ed Gerry, Planning Officers from North Dorset District Council and Jon Gateley and Paul Harrington representing Savills.

**Minutes:** Clerk Malcolm Wilson (MW)

**183/15 - Apologies:** Received from Cllr Huggins and DCC/NDDC Cllr P Batstone (PB)

**184/15 - Declarations of interest:** SM declared a potential pecuniary interest in planning application 2/2015/1224 and JG a personal interest in minute 195/15 as he is a community member of the Recreation Association.

**185/15 – Adoption of the minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015:** The minutes of this meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman.

**186/15 – Matters arising from these minutes:** i) a letter of thanks has been received from Ms E Martin for the garden voucher sent as a “thank you” for storing winter grit supplies, and a note made to repeat next year ii) responses awaited still from Spectrum over the lay-by in Kingston and Mr Spring on the wildflower meadow idea for the Keep iii) Cllr Huggins has deadheaded the ragwort but MR/JG thought the plants were to be pulled and burned on site – the clerk will follow up with KH.

**187/15 – North Dorset District Council – presentation and question and answer session on planning matters:** Steve Clark is the Team Leader South (which includes Hazelbury Bryan) with three planning officers and one enforcement officer. They deal with new applications and enforcement issues. Ed Gerry is the Planning Policy Team Leader looking at planning strategies for the future. Given the new tripartite agreement between NDDC, West Dorset DC and Portland and Weymouth DC changes in structures and responsibilities are likely. A list of questions and answers etc are attached as appendix 1 to these minutes. At the end of the session they were thanked for their informative and helpful contributions.

**188/15 – Planning - to consider planning applications received:** Given declarations of interest above DM took the Chair and SM made no contribution to the discussion or voting

**i) 2/2015/1224/FUL – Handley Cross Farm, Pidney Hill, DT10 2EB - Erect 9 dwellings, 8 live/work dwellings, 2 buildings for business use (B1) and flexible use area for meetings (D1) and associated parking and landscaping works:** Some concerns were expressed over the loss of the affordable housing element of the development and the potentially adverse impact on other community facilities of another meeting room, potentially available for hire. Questions were also asked about the viability of the live/work units and how there might be protected if anticipated demand failed to materialise or occupants wanted to convert the “work” element into the dwelling or a garage. There are concerns over traffic volumes and overspill parking in Pidney but it is accepted that traffic volumes for the proposed development need to be compared to a working warehouse/light industrial site – for which the site has current permission, even if it is mothballed at present. Representatives from Savills responded that the lack of affordable housing reflected current guidelines and economic viability of developing the site but that the legal situation of affordable housing numbers is still fluid and the final outcome will need to be agreed with NDDC. Concerns over the meeting room could be addressed through planning conditions imposed by NDDC as could the status of the live/work units (for which their research indicates there will be sufficient demand).

It was agreed not to object to the application but to ask that conditions be imposed preventing any meeting facility being made available commercially and that the live/work units be subject to strong conditions preventing their conversion to merely residential units.

**ii) 2/2015/1372/CATree – Highbank, Drum Lane, Wonston, DT10 2EE – fell two cypress trees:** No objections

iii) 2/2015/1305/House – Middle Cottage, Partway to Churchfoot Lane, DT10 2EE – erect shed (retrospective): No objections

**189/15 – Public open session:** The helpful presentation from the Planning officers was appreciated

**190/15 – Finance**

**a) To approve accounts for payment:** The following payments were approved:

Cheque	Payee	Service	Net	VAT	Total
	HB Allotment				
906	Assoc	Grant - Ideas Please	750.00		750.00
	Parish Mag				
907	Printers	Sep Bytes	43.00		43.00
908	BDO	External audit	200.00	40.00	240.00
	M				
909	Wilson	Oct pay	240.70		240.70
	M				
910	Wilson	Expenses	98.62		98.62
	Wessex Web				
SO	Design	Web hosting	15.00		15.00
SO	IK Services	Dog bins Oct	97.93		97.93
			Total		1485.25

**b) to approve the audited Annual Return:** The Annual Return for 2014/15 has been signed-off by the external auditors. The comments on risk analysis and those made by the internal auditor have been addressed and the Annual Return was agreed and accepted.

**c) to consider insurance arrangements:** Renewal documentation had not been received and this matter will be deferred until November parish council meeting.

**d) to consider and adopt revised Financial Regulations:** Revised Financial Regulations based on the latest NALC model had been prepared and circulated by the clerk. Principal changes were updated threshold levels for expenditure, updated signing instructions for payments and providing authority for electronic banking in the future. The clerk confirmed the revised mandate instructions have been processed by Lloyds –cheques can now be signed by two councillors (out of SM/DM/KH/AR) or one of these councillors and the clerk. It was agreed to adopt the revised Financial Regulations with immediate effect.

**e) to consider the quarterly financial summary and bank reconciliation:** These had been circulated in advance. There were no questions and the reconciliation was signed-off.

**191/15 – The Antelope path:** Hall and Woodhouse has now agreed in principal for the path to be built. They want another gate entrance onto their land and will talk direct to DCC Highways. Whilst this is good news there may well be legal matters to deal with which might well take longer than we might reasonably anticipate. The clerk will liaise with the various interested parties.

**192/15 – Fingerposts - Kingston – replacement progress:** Unfortunately PB’s contact remains unwell so there is no quote for the new sign. The clerk was asked to deal with alternative suppliers to expedite this matter.

**193/15 – Churchfoot Lane – possible bench and fence:** DCC Highways has confirmed it does not actually own the land but controls its use as part of “the Highway”. If required, they can source and install “dragons teeth” to their required specification, although the parish council will pay. There was some enthusiasm for this to be progressed but first the clerk was asked to ascertain the ownership

of the land so their views can be sought – access into the field behind the gate needs to remain unobstructed.

**194/15 – The Keep:** See minute 186/15 above

**195/15 – Recreation field: a) report:** AR reported that the 2 new springer see-saws have been installed. New wood-chip is needed for the play area safety surface.

**b) to consider governance structure and consider future arrangements:** SM noted the urgency in finalising new Terms of Reference for the Recreation Field committee to enable the next steps to be taken towards the construction of the new pavilion. It was agreed the most productive way to achieve this would be to delegate the power to a working group of SM/DM/JG/AR and the clerk which would meet at 7.15pm on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> October. **c) trees in hedge in Pidney:** In the hedge between Mrs Hedley's property and the Recreation Field there are two elm trees that have fallen and remain supported by a wild plum tree. The elms need removing and the plum pruned or pollarded. Ownership is uncertain, but it was agreed to pay half the cost, estimated in the region of £250. The clerk will progress.

**196/15 – Village hall – report:** DM reported that the village hall open day is on 10<sup>th</sup> October and there is a quiz on 17<sup>th</sup> October

**197/15 – DCC/NDDC Cllr Batstone:** No report in her absence

**198/15 - Public open session:** It's been a year since the Kingston fingerpost was knocked over – can we please have it back as soon as possible!

**199/15 – Correspondence to note:** DCC's "Working Together" report was noted.

**200/15 – Date of next meeting:** Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2015 at 8.00 pm in the village hall

**201/15 – Close of meeting:** With no further business to discuss SM closed the meeting at 10.00 pm.

#### **APPENDIX 1 – PLANNING Q&A SESSION**

- 1. What role does the PC have in Planning Applications?** It is a consultee, and represents local opinion. Its views have "weight" and if the parish council objects and asks for an application to go to Committee to be determined by councillors, not the case officer, this will usually be the case.
- 2. What criteria should PCs use in assessing applications and on what grounds can they object?** If objecting to an application, this must be made on material planning grounds – the impact on the local character, the amenity of neighbours and the community, size/mass, highway safety, heritage, bio-diversity are relevant. Loss of view or loss of value of neighbouring properties are not valid grounds.
- 3. What teeth does a neighbourhood plan have or are they of limited use to a PC?** The new NDDC Local Plan (part 1) should be approved and be in place by Spring 2016 and will run until 2031. Any NP that is approved will sit alongside this in terms of planning policy. Planning Policies are the key items in considering planning applications. NP takes a lot of work, but enable communities to develop policies for where development might be, how much there might be based on housing need, what it might look like and other locally important matters.
- 4. If we went through the machinations of creating a neighbourhood plan, can NDDC overturn the plan having first taken due recognition of the plan?** NDDC is the determining planning authority. In this role it has to follow its own and any NP policies BUT there is always a caveat that "other material considerations" may take precedence. Central government may change the NPPF etc.
- 5. Having been advised a 12 months or so ago that HB would fall under the countryside plan, i.e. no allocated number of houses and only infill etc, NDDC have now U turned and we have to take a share of 800 +. What was the catalyst for this change, and can this number increase over the term of their**

**plan?** The initial draft of the NDDC Local Plan sought to remove settlement boundaries and rely on Countryside Policy for non-urban development. This was rejected at Examination so the policy of retaining settlement boundaries had to be re-instated –so there is a presumption that development will be approved within settlement boundaries and only exception sites agreed outside it. The revised NDDC Local Plan calls for a MINIMUM of 825 new homes in the 19 larger, sustainable villages between now and 2031. This excludes existing approvals apparently. At present there is no pro-rata allocation between communities. However, once the LP 1 is approved, work will begin on LP 2 which will look at individual villages in much more detail and it may be more specific allocations are made. LP 2 will take two or three years to prepare, so maybe 2019. These would take account of any NP in place (but one imagines that when approving any NP between now and 2019 NDDC will have a keen eye on whether they deliver “enough” new housing – to meet local needs and the needs of the District.

**6. What is our ‘share’ of the houses the ‘sustainable’ villages have to accommodate?** See above

**7. Our roads/school/infrastructure etc cannot, in my opinion, accommodated substantial numbers of new houses. How is this taken into account when planning is decided?** The adequacy of local infrastructure is taken into account for large developments, say 10+ dwellings. S106 agreements have been used, the Community Infrastructure Levy will replace in due course. The CIL will be paid on even a single new dwelling. In terms of schools, DCC sets the figures to be charged on new developments and the money goes into the central Education pot at DCC – it doesn’t go to the local school directly. Currently it’s around £2k for primary and £6k for secondary schools. For roads and pavements etc there is an individual assessment of each development – for a development of 50 houses outside a village centre it might be the case that a safe route into the village might be required from the developer.

**8. What happens to potential developments whilst any plan we embark upon is in train – ie if it takes 2 – 3 years to complete are we now exposed to new developments?** Following some recent legal judgements, no weight can be given to an emerging NP until it has been passed at a referendum.

**9. Can the potential Pidney development (2/2015/1224) be our ‘share’ of the additional housing the sustainable villages will be required to accommodate?** There is no “share” as above.

**10. If consultations sent to us can’t be dealt with within the 21 day period (because we don’t have a parish council meeting scheduled, what flexibility is there to delay the application process to allow the parish council comments to be made?** NDDC has to meet its statutory timetable of handling applications – 8 weeks for simple, 12 weeks for more complicated. If there are going to be problems then speak to the case officer to see if some slippage in the 21 days might be possible; if not a special planning meeting might have to be called by the parish council.

This was a very useful session. It is clear that planning is rarely clear cut or black and white – 50 shades of grey seems more appropriate

DRAFT